



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/329,321	06/10/1999	MARI KORKEA-AHO	017.36935X00	7967

20457 7590 03/05/2003

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, MARC D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/329,321

Applicant(s)
KORKEA-AHO

Examiner
Marc Thompson

Art Unit
2142



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/6/2003, amendment A.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-13, 15-25, and 27-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-13, 15-25, and 27-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

MARC THOMPSON
940 2142
Part of Paper No. 5

Art Unit: 2142

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment A, received on 1/6/2003, has been entered into record.
2. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-25, and 27-36 remain pending.

Priority

3. No claim for priority has been made in this application.
4. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 6/10/1999.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 13, 15-17, 20, 25, 27-29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by DeLorme (U.S. Patent Number 5,848,373), hereinafter referred to as DeLorme.

7. DeLorme disclosed a portable computing device, with an optionally coupled GPS location unit, which acted to output various types of mapping materials which correlated information using locational coordinates for indication or incorporation on the map(s). See Abstract, Column 3, Lines 56-67, Column 4, Lines 21-38, Column 7, Line 40 through

Art Unit: 2142

Column 8, Line 65, and Column 9, Line 56 through Column 11, Line 5. The incorporation of HTML and HTTP as Internet transports and standardized data delivery format including remote database querying, information addressing, and dynamic output generation provided selective filtering of gathered information for display to a requesting client user. Thus, the breadth of the claimed invention lends itself to complete anticipation in light of this reference. A detailed mapping of DeLorme to the claimed invention follows:

(Claims 1, 13, 25)

a. *A storage which stores location information in corresponding relation to each of plurality of geographical points*, was taught by DeLorme, inter alia, in Column 13, Lines 5-30, and Column 16, Line 46 through Column 17, Line 48.

b. *Location information provides information concerning said geographical point*, was taught by DeLorme, inter alia, in Column 16, Line 46 through Column 17, Line 48.

c. *Location information is stored in storage by users of mobile terminals for use by other users of mobile terminals when information about a geographical point is desired*, was taught by DeLorme in Column 17, Lines 38-64, and Column 44, Lines 18-45.

d. *Storage and retrieval means*,

i. *Responsive to a storage request, including positioning information, from a user of a mobile terminal for storing location information about a geographical point located at [the specified] positioning information, and*

Art Unit: 2142

ii. *Responsive to a retrieval request, including positioning information, from a user of a mobile terminal for retrieving desired location information concerning a geographical point corresponding to the positioning information*, was taught by DeLorme, inter alia, in Column 17, Lines 24-37, Column 21, Lines 32-40, Column 22, Lines 35-65, Column 24, Lines 11-23, and Column 44, Lines 18-45.

(Claims 3, 15, 27)

e. *Positioning information included in each of storage and retrieval requests transmitted by mobile terminal indicates a geographical position of mobile terminal*, was taught by DeLorme, inter alia, in Column 17, Lines 49-64.

(Claims 4, 16, 28)

f. *Positioning information is supplied by a positioning system*, was taught by DeLorme, inter alia, in Column 17, Lines 49-64.

(Claims 5, 17, 29)

g. *Positioning information is input by a terminal user*, was taught by DeLorme, inter alia, in Column 21, Lines 32-40, and Column 63, Lines 38-55.

(Claims 7, 20, 32)

h. *Virtual electronic document providing information corresponding to the geographical point*, was taught by DeLorme, inter alia, in Column 29, Lines 5-48.

Art Unit: 2142

8. Thus, since the all the limitations of the claimed invention as set forth in claims 1, 3-5, 7, 13, 15-17, 20, 25, 27-29, and 32 were expressly disclosed by DeLorme, claims 1, 3-5, 7, 13, 15-17, 20, 25, 27-29, and 32 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-25, 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phelan et al. (Patent Number WO 97/07467), hereinafter referred to as Phelan, in view of Potmesil ("Maps alive: Viewing Geospatial Information on the WWW", Computer Networks and ISDN systems 29, 1997), hereinafter referred to as Potmesil, further in view of what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

11. Phelan disclosed a combined map and location information providing service available to mobile (handheld or laptop) computing units, optionally equipped with GPS to isolate current client terminal position, resulting in a system which queried database(s) and returned pertinent information to a requesting client user. See, inter alia, Abstract, Page 2, Line 30 through Page 3, Line 33. The system was further equipped with well known prior art HTML enabled information transport and display specifications. See, inter alia, Page 1, Line 26 through Page 2, Line 6.

Art Unit: 2142

12. While Phelan disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Phelan did not specifically disclose the actual storage of locational information received from a client terminal. Phelan disclosed multiple databases containing geographically located data, including description, location, classification, and detailing information about points of interest on a map based interface. Thus, it was clear that this information was stored in digital form, and any artisan would realize this information was not random, and must have been a result of some form of storage, compilation, and indexing means, seemingly omitted from the teachings of Phelan. That is, Phelan remained silent as to the specifics of information storage, how the information was input into the database(s), and the specific equipment and/or methodology required to result in the system as described. Thus, an ordinary artisan would have been motivated to search the related portable terminal, web-based mapping and information delivery systems to find systems which fully describe the collection, posting, insertion, and indexing of the information within the databases which were utilized by Phelan.

In the same art of coordinating information with geographical locations, Potmesil disclosed the ability for client terminals to post geographically indexed information to databases used in a system which supplies information upon demand to geographically filtering requesting clients. See inter alia, Section 1, Page 1327, and Section 2.3, Page 1330. Thus, given that the ordinary artisan understands how to construct functional web browsers which routinely accessed and manipulated information within database(s), the incorporation of the general teaching(s) of associating client user input with specific points on a given coordinate system was realized.

Art Unit: 2142

Lastly, the incorporation of specifically identified fields, for example in claim 6, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, since the teachings of Phelan and Potmesil directly alluded to use of such stored information in regular operation of the system. Database fields including position/geographical point information, ID and title/classification information, access rights for specified classes of users, (hyper)linked addressing information, date of creation information, etc., were well within the skill of one with ordinary knowledge in the field, and the result of processing of these fields was present in the combined teachings. Of course, the storage of all information came at a price: the consumption of memory. Given that the disclosed document, information, and map servers were little more than huge storage devices, it was a matter of design choice to incorporate these specific database fields. Of course, the more information which was available, the more versatile a searching system became. Thus, it would have been obvious to incorporate the various recited database fields set forth in the claim limitations, simply to provide more information for more versatility in filtering pertinent information.

Thus, the combination of Phelan, Potmesil, and the knowledge within scope of one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have made the invention obvious, resulting in a geographical locational mapping system, fully functional in a wide-area network environment using HTML and HTTP, which supplied and gathered information related directly to geographical points for storage and filtering on remote network databases.

A detailed mapping of the claims to the prior art follows:

Art Unit: 2142

(Claims 1, 13, 25)

a. *A storage which stores location information in corresponding relation to each of plurality of geographical points*, was taught by Phelan, inter alia, in Page 4, Lines 4-13, and was taught by Potmesil in, inter alia, Section 2.2, Page 1330.

b. *Location information provides information concerning said geographical point*, was taught by Phelan in, inter alia, Page 4, Lines 27-30, and was taught by Potmesil in, inter alia, Section 2.2, Page 1330.

c. *Location information is stored in storage by users of mobile terminals for use by other users of mobile terminals when information about a geographical point is desired*, was taught by Potmesil in Sections 1, and 2.3. The use of a “spatial bulletin board” function/server, provided user postings related to particular coordinates, and the ability for other users to access this information.

d. *Storage and retrieval means*,

i. *Responsive to a storage request, including positioning information, from a user of a mobile terminal for storing location information about a geographical point located at [the specified] positioning information*, and

ii. *Responsive to a retrieval request, including positioning information, from a user of a mobile terminal for retrieving desired location information concerning a geographical point corresponding to the positioning information*, was taught by Phelan in, inter alia, Page 5, Lines 1-36, Page 10, Lines 10-23, and Page 13, Lines 3-31, and was taught by Potmesil in, inter

Art Unit: 2142

alia, Section 1, Page 1328-1329, Sections 2.2 through 2.4, Pages 1330-1332, and Section 3.3, Pages 1333-1334.

(Claims 3, 15, 27)

e. *Positioning information included in each of storage and retrieval requests transmitted by mobile terminal indicates a geographical position of mobile terminal*, was taught by Phelan in, inter alia, Page 6, Line 34 through Page 7, Line 9, and Page 10, Lines 10-23, and was taught by Potmesil in Sections 2.3-2.4, Pages 1330-1332.

(Claims 4, 16, 28)

f. *Positioning information is supplied by a positioning system*, was taught by Phelan in Page 13, Line 28 through Page 14, Line 34.

(Claims 5, 17, 29)

g. *Positioning information is input by a terminal user*, was taught by Phelan in, inter alia, Page 14, Lines 19-27, and Page 16, Lines 3-29, and was taught by Potmesil in, inter alia, Section 1, Pages 1327-1329.

(Claims 6, 18, 30)

h. *Location information of geographical point includes: Position information of geographical point, ID information including a geographical point name, Title information of location information, Type of geographical point/location information, Owner of location information, Access rights of users for location information, Comments of a creator information, Link information for linking other information, Date of creation information, Expiration date*

Art Unit: 2142

information, were either expressly mentioned/described by the combination of Phelan and Potmesil, or would have been obvious to incorporate and utilize as further informational filters, as explained above.

(Claims 7, 20, 32)

i. *Virtual electronic document providing information corresponding to the geographical point*, and

(Claims 8, 21, 33)

j. *Virtual electronic document is a web page*, was taught by Phelan, inter alia, in Page 11, Lines 24-35, and was taught by Potmesil, inter alia, in Section 3.3.5, Pages 1335-1337. Both teachings were riddled with WAN, Internet, WWW, HTML, and HTTP conforming standards, providing “virtual” documents as web pages.

(Claims 9, 12, 19, 22, 31, 34)

k. *Web page is linked to other [web] pages*, was taught by Phelan in Page 12, Lines 10-14, and was taught by Potmesil in Section 1, Pages 1327-1329, as well as being inherent in a hyperlinking browsing system. This “linking” was the purpose such a system and method of information delivery and transfer was invented and implemented.

(Claims 10, 11, 23, 24, 35, 36)

l. *Web page is linked to other web pages on same server or other network accessible server*, was taught by Phelan, inter alia, in Page 6, Lines 24-33, and was taught by Potmesil, inter alia, in Sections 1 and 2, Pages 1327-1332.

Art Unit: 2142

Since all the claimed limitations set forth in the presented claims were either expressly described in the combined prior art of record, or within the scope of what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, claims 1-36 are rejected.

13. Claims 6, 8-10, 11-12, 18-19, 21-24, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeLorme as detailed above, further in view of what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

14. DeLorme disclosed the invention substantially as claimed as detailed in the above rejection. DeLorme failed to specifically disclose each and every locational object database field used when storing and subsequently filtering stored information for output display. However, a number of these fields were specifically disclosed, and suggestion for incorporation of "a lengthy document or extensive database inside of [the] standard [loc/object] data structure." See Column 28, Line 19 through Column 29, Line 48, and Column 30, Lines 3-20. Further, DeLorme failed to specifically disclose the use of hypertext markup language (HTML), although DeLorme specifically mentioned "linking" information to other information and to avatars (inter alia, Column 29, Lines 5-23), as well as combining text, graphics, and database querying of internal and external database(s) (inter alia, Column 30, Lines 3-20). An ordinary artisan in the computer arts would have been well aware of the global Internet, which has been growing exponentially since 1995 in both users and available services. The global Internet was

Art Unit: 2142

notoriously well known to implement hypertext markup language (HTML) for information formatting on a typical Internet “browser”, and hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) for actual network transport of HTML and other types of digital data. HTML was indeed created for this particular situation; the sharing of network stored information using addressing and the incorporation of various types of information into formatted documents, HTML documents (web pages). Also see taking of Official Notice as set forth in “Response to Arguments”, subparagraph (a), below. Thus, it would have obvious to an ordinary artisan to use HTML in the system of DeLorme in order to provide a mechanism for retrieving, formatting, and displaying the client requested information in a typical network browser, as suggested by DeLorme in Column 26, Lines 15-30. Thus,

a. *Location information of geographical point includes:*

i. *Position information of geographical point, ID information including a geographical point name, Title information of location information, Type of geographical point/location information, Owner of location information, Access rights of users for location information, Comments of a creator information, Link information for linking other information, Date of creation information, and Expiration date information,* would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan in view of DeLorme, Column 30, Lines 3-20. The association of the location object with information directly related to the object comes directly at the cost of database memory storage, whether that space was local or remote to the object storage. These database fields associated with a particular locational object were a matter of design choice, and one

Art Unit: 2142

which would increase the “richness” of the locational object associated information. That is, more related data resulted in more filtering options, and more location object specific information.

b. *Virtual electronic document is a web page*, would have been inherent in a system which utilized HTML. As outlined above, the use of HTML would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan working with the DeLorme system in order to share, compile, and display the client requested information in a formatted fashion, additionally providing dynamic generation of the HTML documents (web pages) with relevant, filtered information.

c. *Web page is linked to other [web] pages*, was included with the incorporation of HTML into the DeLorme system detailed in Column 29, Lines 5-23. The intended purpose of HTML was known to incorporate “linking” of stored, related information to other HTML documents by using document addresses. Linking together web pages (HTML documents) was an inherent function of the well known, and widely implemented HTML specification.

d. *Web page is linked to other web pages on same server or other network accessible server*, would have resulted through the use of HTML, and the disclosed operation of the DeLorme system in, inter alia, Column 30, Lines 3-20. Again, this was a known, widely implemented feature of HTML, inherent in any system utilizing this particular markup language.

Since the invention as claimed would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made in view of DeLorme and the widely implemented use of HTML for

Art Unit: 2142

document storage, document formatting, and linking of related, specified documents, claims 6, 8-10, 11-12, 18-19, 21-24, and 30-31 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant seems apprehensive to admit that the use of HTML and HTTP on an internet was well known at the time of invention, noted by continual use of "alleged Official Notice as set forth by the Examiner." To set the record straight, Examiner now takes Official Notice (see MPEP § 2144.03) that HTML and HTTP and the presence of an internet in the computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the invention was made, as exemplified by several of the patents cited as relevant for this application. The Applicant is entitled to traverse the official notice according to MPEP § 2144.03. However, MPEP § 2144.03 further states "See also *In re Boon*, 439 F.2d 724, 169 USPQ 231 (CCPA 1971) (a challenge to the taking of judicial notice must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying the judicial notice)." Specifically, *In re Boon*, 169 USPQ 231, 234 states "as we held in *Ahlert*, an applicant must be given the opportunity to challenge either the correctness of the fact asserted or the notoriety or repute of the reference cited in support of the assertion. We did not mean to imply by this statement that a bald challenge, with nothing more, would be all that was needed". Further note that 37 CFR §

Art Unit: 2142

1.671(c)(3) states "Judicial notice means official notice". Thus, a traversal by the Applicant that is merely "a bald challenge, with nothing more" will be given very little weight.

b. Applicant argues the presently claimed invention is directed to "a collaborative system whereby users of mobile terminal[s] can store location information regarding a geographical point in a collaborative storage device when positioned near the geographical point and such information stored by the users of the mobile terminals are accessible by other users of the mobile terminals so as to obtain desired location information about a geographical point located at a particular position." See Response, Amendment A, Paper #4, Page 7, Lines 8-17.

c. Applicant argues DeLorme did not disclose functionality providing "each of the users of the mobile terminals to input location information regarding a geographical point when positioned near the geographical point so as to be accessible by other users of mobile terminals when location information about a particular point is desired...[and failure to] provide a central server which stores information input by users of mobile terminals that can be shared with other users of mobile terminals." See Response, Amendment A, Paper #4, Page 8, Line 20 through Page 9, Line 3.

In response to these two arguments, a single, clear-cut example of this express functionality is now provided, as clearly set forth by DeLorme. See Figures 14A-14F. A car (92) used antenna (90) to report an accident at a street intersection. See Figure 14A. Alternatively, a user (cop, driver, etc.) at the location (or elsewhere), manually inputted the information relative to the accident. See Figure 14D. Wirelessly, the information, including positioning information

Art Unit: 2142

(coordinates) was transferred to the central dispatch office (94). The accident data was then available in one of the myriad of databases, at the central office or elsewhere (specifically enabled by DeLorme), to be accessed by other mobile users, like tow truck drivers, or commuting workers. See Figure 14C. Clearly, this information was available to other users of the system, including any said tow truck drivers, since the information was stored within the central dispatch office database for query. This conclusively described both storage and retrieval of user created records correlating to specific geographical locations specified by coordinates. See Column 63, Lines 11 through Column 64, Line 7. Lastly, DeLorme expressly disclosed remote user “geocoding” information, which correlated specified information to specific coordinate systems for later query and retrieval. See Column 44, Lines 18-45.

Thus, this line of argument is not persuasive, since DeLorme expressly disclosed the use of mobile terminals to create database records assigned to particular geographical locations, transfer of this information to remotely maintained database(s), and the remote access of this information, on demand, from an authorized user of one or many informational databases.

d. Lastly, it is noted that Potmesil expressly disclosed functionality drawn toward posting locational information correlating to a particular geographical point as detailed in the above, and previous, rejection. It is further noted that Applicant failed to address the teachings of Potmesil at all, neglecting to properly determine the basis of rejection of the previously submitted claims. It is submitted that Potmesil, in addition to DeLorme, disclosed the specification, upload, and database storage of shared user input for distribution to requesting users of the mapping system.

Art Unit: 2142

Since Applicant has failed to even address the Potmesil teachings in regard to the claimed invention, any alleged difference between this piece of prior art and the claimed invention, in view of the current and previous rejections, cannot be established.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Marc Thompson whose telephone number is (703) 308-6750. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9am to 4pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell, can be reached at (703) 305-9703. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-9731.

Art Unit: 2142

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238	(After Final Communications only)
(703) 746-7239	(Official Communications)
(703) 746-7240	(for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900, or Customer Service for Technology Center 2100 at (703) 306-5631.

MARC THOMPSON
Marc D. Thompson
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142